

## **REMARKS**

Claims 11-14 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claim 15 is added. Therefore, claims 1-10 and 15 are the claims currently pending in the Application.

The Examiner objects to several minor errors in the Specification (Office Action, page 5.) Paragraphs of the Specification are amended to correct these minor errors. Therefore, the objection to the Specification should now be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 2 are amended to clarify features recited thereby.

### ***Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103***

Claims 1-3, 5-7 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103, as being obvious from Brewer et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,918,016 and Sharony, U.S. Patent No. 5,652,751. This rejection is traversed.

Among the problems recognized and solved by Applicant's claimed invention is that of managing a move by a mobile terminal from a first network to a second network and configuring the mobile terminal accordingly. According to an aspect of Applicant's claimed invention, when a mobile terminal is moved from a first network, such as an infrastructure network with a network server, to a second network, such as an ad hoc network, including for example a wireless ad hoc network, the move is managed by the mobile terminal such that the mobile terminal is configured according to the type of network to which the mobile terminal is connected. The cited references, including

Brewer and Sharony, do not identify this problem, let alone disclose or suggest the solutions provided by Applicant's claimed invention.

Independent claim 1 requires *inter alia*, a mobile terminal with a move manager that detects whether the mobile terminal is moved from the network. (Please see the attached Appendix for the text of claim 1.) Further, independent claim 2 requires, *inter alia* a mobile terminal with a move management means to manage whether or not the movable terminal has moved from the network.

Brewer discloses a system for automating protocol assignment when newly connected to varying computer networks. More particularly, Brewer discloses that: when a computer is reconnected to a network to which it has been previously connected, the IP settings, including an IP address assigned to the computer, is obtained without having manually to reconfigure the computer (Brewer, col. 7, lines 20-58); the user clicks on a network to be connected to the mobile terminal (Brewer col. 10, lines 5-26, col. 12, lines 65-col. 13, line 12; and Figure 4); and that the computer may issue a "discover" command to determine whether the network includes a DHCP server and is therefore a network capable of a dynamic address configuration or is static network without a DHCP function.

Brewer does not disclose or suggest a mobile terminal that detects whether the mobile has moved from the network. The Examiner cites Brewer's teaching of a DHCP lease packet to discover the type of network to be connected, and alleges that Brewer discloses that the mobile unit outputs a packet in response to a move. As discussed, Brewer discloses that a step 20 of Figure 3, to set the indicator representing

whether the base network to which the mobile terminal is to be connected is dynamic or static, may be accomplished by the mobile computer H3 issuing a “discover” command to the network. (Brewer, col. 9, lines 21-34, discussing Fig. 3). If a reply is received to the “discover” command by the mobile computer H3, then at step 20 the indicator is set as a dynamically configurable network. (Brewer, col. 9, lines 28-31).

However, Brewer discloses that this step 20 is performed after step 18 of Figure 3, which involves connecting the mobile computer to a base network, which as discussed has to be done when a user recognizes that the mobile computer is moved to a new network, by the user’s clicking to connect the mobile computer to the newly designated network. Thus, Brewer discloses that the user must recognize a need to connect to a different network and must takes action to do so (clicking on the “connect” softbutton to connect to a new network), and that at that point the mobile may issue a “discover” command to determine to what type of network, DHCP or static, connection is sought by the user.

Therefore, Brewer does not disclose or suggest a mobile terminal with a move manager that detects whether the mobile terminal is moved from the network, as *inter alia*, required by independent claim 1. Further, Brewer does not disclose or suggest a mobile terminal with a move management means to manage whether or not the movable terminal has moved from the network, as *inter alia*, required by independent claim 2. Thus, Brewer does not disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claims 1 and 2.

Sharony does not cure the deficiencies of Brewer as they relate to independent claims 1 and 2. Sharony discloses a radio communications network with nodes that are subject to a dynamically changing topology of the network, such that nodes are grouped into physical and virtual subnets of the network. Further, the Examiner does not allege that Sharony discloses the above-discussed features of claims 1 and 2. Therefore, Brewer and Sharony, even if taken together in combination, do not disclose or suggest the recitations of independent claims 1 and 2.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that there would have been no motivation for combining Brewer and Sharony as suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner alleges that the motivation for combining Brewer and Sharony would have been that an ad hoc network allows for a dynamic architecture.

However the Examiner cites no teaching in Brewer, Sharony or any other reference that would have motivated for the proposed combination. For example, the Examiner cites no teaching that would motivate for the desirability of allowing a mobile computer to move between an ad hoc network and an infrastructure network, nor a teaching that would motivate for the desirability of allowing a mobile computer to detect or to manage a move between two networks, as claimed by Applicant's invention. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

A Petition for a two-month extension of time, with fee, is filed herewith.

For at least the reasons set forth in the foregoing discussion, Applicant believes that the Application is now allowable, and respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider the rejections and allow the Application. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding this Amendment, or regarding the Application generally, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully Submitted



George Brieger  
Registration No. 52,652

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser  
400 Garden City Plaza  
Garden City, New York 11530  
(516) 742-4343 Ext. 503

GB:eg

Enclosure: Petition for EOT (2 months) with check.